

WMPR Meeting Minutes:

1/18/05 Meeting with the WaMT

State Patrol Headquarters, DeForest – Intersection of I 90/94 and County Hwy V

Purpose of meeting: Sue and Mike

- Discuss the final recommendations
- Provide clarification
- Add value
- Seek buy-in

Context: Why we took on the Program Redesign challenge

Resource reductions and response to stakeholders - Sue

Trust an issue we needed to address- Barb

Final recommendations in the context of how we responded to comments received

Organizational structure – Larry

STRUCTURE DISCUSSION:

- Maintain interaction/communication between C.O. and Regions when implementing future teams ~ membership concerns
- Will Regional staff be aligned similar to Bureau staff?
- Staffing level questions for sections, also funding questions
- Staff “specialist v. generalist” and flexibility in implementation for WMS, hydros and engineers
- Team Leader Classification – what happens in the future?
- Experts role in future organization beyond hydro and engineer – other program areas
- Discussion with the other 2 team leaders on the future of teams and classifications and status
- Waste Management Spec. duties v. hydro work and engineer work assignments. Value of work done by all employees in program.

Plan Review Proposal – Dennis, Connie

WHY?

- Staff displeasure with the current system
- Can't balance workload statewide, easily
 - Matching staff abilities w/incoming plans
- Increased efficiency, expertise of plan reviewer

External desire for change a mixed bag.

DISCUSSION:

- PDs – classifications, wages, work w/HR needed on this – lots of issues to work through
- Plan review ‘sting from wording’
 - Ash v. Sludge v.
- Use of ‘experts’ in plan review
 - Use care in phrasing and terminology
- Plan review assignments – who is doing the assignments?

- Where are the incoming plans going? C.O.? Regions? (the latter). Experts have more of a coordinative/objective view of statewide workload. Try to maintain region staff connections with local sites.
- Multiple masters – eliminate expert signature. More of an advisory capacity, collaborator with the regional supervisors.
- Multiple value sets – Avoid 'elite' core status
- File location issues
- Historical knowledge of site
- Bug-a-boo – precedent setting issues by staff
 - Statutory deadline issues
- Experts need to work w/Regions on precedent setting issues
 - Need a collaborative relationship
- Experts need to know incoming plans
 - Mail a copy to them?
- Assignments out of the regions – need Region Supervisor buy-in
- Regionalization (working beyond regions) a PLUS
- Are designated 'staff' chosen?

Implementation Plan Chart Overview – Mike

Implementations Work Exercise: Fleshing out the near term details.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE DISCUSSION:

- Charge needs to be more explicit
 - Bureau structure → Beyond
 - Plan review, teams bureau – which piece falls in which work group
- Identify that these teams must work with the other teams they may be impacting. List under dependencies.
- Workload impacts – FTE hours, performance measures, “what won't get done?” what is set aside during implementation?
- Prioritize overall themes – activities. Set up a timeline w/staff resource needs.
- Blue Ribbon Task force – out-of-state waste: develop work sheet
- Vernacular – foundation, base, pillar, infrastructure
- Products associated with specific dates – need details. What (?) is expected by when (xx/xxxx)
- Realistic goals in the time we have – what are the priorities?
- Follow thru w/staff on expectations
- **Organization work sheet #1:**
 - Activity needs to be specific. Put plan review in Org. #1 into Org. #2
 - Balance work load amongst the 3 organization work groups
 - Change 'designate' to another term to avoid mis-perceptions by staff and issues with HR or the Unions.
 - First step is to go thru HR to determine what we can and can't do.
 - Under Sideboards: What does dislocate mean? Relocate staff v. different job duties => minimize reassignment and dislocation OR disruption
- Organization work sheet #2:
 - First step is to go thru HR to determine what we can and can't do.
 - Define criteria for determining who is identified to be plan review staff – determine means by which we identify staff

- Expand activity – Identify how all plan review (incl non-landfill review) will be done and include experts, precedent/unusual reviews. Leave in HW licensing in this work group.
- General: Where do the work groups get answers to questions? Define time frame for clarification of work.
 - Clarify where the # of staff came from
 - Who is going to address specialists and bureau staff?
 - If you have comments, send them in ASAP.

Decision making in the program – this will be an issue that the WaMT deals with

Next Steps

- What we heard today- where we go from here – final report to AI on 1/21, incorporate clarifications, recommendations
- WaMT needs to finalize the work groups for implementation at the 2/9 meeting – groups need to start soon
- Provide comments on work sheets, especially the ones we did not discuss
- Provide 'vote' on name for program by end of day, Wednesday:
 - Waste and Materials Management
 - Waste Materials Management
 - Trash and Treasure Program
 - Pollution Prevention and Waste Management
- Treat the report confidentially, we will have a roll-out plan for all staff
- Meeting with the AWMT on Feb. 1